This document is one of three the Implementation Work Group prepared in the course of developing specific recommendations for the FACDQ to consider. It is intended to be an informational document only. The recommendations are presented in a separate document.

Guidance, Outreach, and Training

Guidance

In order to successfully implement the new procedure for detection and quantitation, guidance from EPA will be critical. All of the different QL types (nat, state, per, lab) are likely to get confusing. Stakeholders will require help understanding what it means for them

This is not a situation where regulatory changes can be made unless the tools for providing guidance are already in place. This means EPA's 'how to' guidance will need to come out before or at the same time as its regulations. EPA should provide States guidance documents to implement recommendations in the most consistent fashion. This will level the playing field for all permittees and make it easier for laboratories to serve their clients.

Initially, state regulators will need to be trained in the technical aspects of detection and quantitation so they are better able to understand the FACDQ recommendations and EPA's proposed rules. This will help as they:

- Visualize the proposed approach
- Understand how it will impact their own regulatory programs
- Review and comment on proposed rules
- Buy into the effort to make procedures more uniform nationwide
- See how the program might evolve

States could benefit from interstate information transfer. For example:

- Permitting approaches, including standard permit language
- Exchange of information on State QLs may be useful so states don't have to use both a descriptive process for analytes without a QLnat and a prescriptive process for those with a QLnat

Outreach and Training

The implementation of the new DL/QL procedures is an "opportunity" for EPA/States to assist laboratories through outreach training programs. It would be helpful to have EPA develop training materials that could be used by any public/private organization. This would maintain some uniformity and consistency. The need to work with the nationally certifying/accrediting programs (A2LA, NELAP, ISO) and method development organizations (ASTM, AWWA) to recognize the new procedures and possibly assist in training laboratories in the use of the procedure(s) is a critical component.

EPA should coordinate with its Regional Offices and the State regulators and provide training and or workshops to ensure that the recommended Uses are interpreted properly and understood. Ideally, affected stakeholders such as laboratories, permittees, and environmental groups should be invited to participate in these workshops.

The FAC would like EPA to do implementation planning to try to visualize the issues that will come up with approaches and adjust accordingly. Examples of topics and issues that could be addressed through guidance, outreach, and training may include:

- Compliance Evaluation Determination

Example: For the sake of discussion, what happens if a laboratory implements the new procedure(s) early and gets a higher DL/QL than what they have previously reported? The existing permit identifies a lower limit based on either historical DL/QL ability or a limit based on EPA's promulgated MDL or ML. How will the regulator work with the new procedure higher DL/QL limits and "QNR" or "DNR" results? Remember, there will be a mix of laboratories that will implement the new procedure(s) early and those that will wait until the law requires it. In this situation, some permittees using the labs with the new DL/QL's may be out of compliance while other permittees using laboratories that are using the old MDL procedure will be in compliance.

Example: What would happen if the new DL or QL is higher than what is needed to demonstrate compliance? For example would that analyte then fall into the category of QL > WQBEL? Also, how would one determine if matrix effects or intermittent blank contamination were impacting ones ability to achieve the required DL or QL and how would alternative or corrective actions be implemented

- Reporting

Example: If the recommendation is to report numbers below the quantitation level with alphabetical codes ("DNQ," for example), do the DMRs or electronic databases have to be changed to accommodate the codes?

Example: If, along with reporting "zero" or "DNQ" for below-QL numbers you are also supposed to report the actual numbers for information purposes, where are the numbers to be reported: in a separate section of the DMR (the "comments" section, for example), or in a separate report? Does the certification that the results are "true, accurate, and complete" apply to those numbers as well, or only to the zero or "DNQ"? If we are reporting a below-QL number as "zero" for compliance purposes even though all we really know is that it is below the QL or the DL, do we have to modify the certification (for example, by having EPA state in guidance that the certification as "true, accurate, and complete" means only that we have used the correct method in the correct manner and accurately reported the measurements)? Perhaps this issue needs to be addressed by EPA at the time of rule-making or, prior to rule-making, EPA needs to develop a new certification statement that does not sabotage efforts to successfully implement the FACDQ recommendations.

The FACDQ recognizes that there will likely be implementation issues that are not predicted. To accommodate this eventuality, there needs to be enough flexibility built into the system that allows EPA, the states and others to react appropriately to solve the problems.